

REMARKS

The Examiner's rejection of claims 1-7 for being unpatentable under 35 USC § 103(a) over the Hofmann U.S. Patent No. 6,224,751 in view of the Mancil U.S. Patent No. 5,843,309, as this rejection may be attempted to be applied to amended and new claims 2-8, is respectfully traversed.

In support of this traverse, it is first pointed out that the Hofmann patent discloses a well known kitchen water purifying device (the Hofmann invention being an indicator). This device uses a cartridge containing an ion exchanger or the like. Water is poured into the cartridge, filtered and then used for food or drinking. This system works discontinuously.

Further it is noted that the Mancil patent discloses a water purification device where water passes an input water port 8, then through a filter and afterwards is treated with UV-radiation. This device works continuously. A UV-lamp is fed into the device from the top of the device. There is no handle and no cover, because both are not needed for the Mancil device.

Applicant submits that it would not be obvious to combine Hofmann with Mancil to come up with applicant's apparatus.

One would have to leave the feature of a continuous device. Further one would have to reshape the filter cartridge and remove it from the cover in order to install a UV-lamp with a control circuit.

The Examiner's rejection of claims 3-7 for being unpatentable under 35 USC § 103(a) over the Hofmann U.S. Patent No. 6,224,751 in view of the Mancil U.S. Patent No. 5,843,309 and further in view of the Reber et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,180,003, as this rejection may be attempted to be applied to amended and new claims 2-8, is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that, to combine Reber et al. with Hofmann et al. and Mancil, the ordinary artisan would further have the problem of how to open the cover, since the lengthy UV-lamp would block it. Accordingly there is no motivation to combine Hofmann et al. and Mancil and one skilled in the art would have no reason to turn also to Reber et al..

Reber et al. discloses an apparatus for disinfecting water by the means of a UV-source. This source can be mounted on the container or on the cap. But Reber et al. does not show how it would be mounted on the container.

In contradistinction, applicant now calls for an apparatus in new claim 8 where the UV source is rigidly mounted to a bottom of the container and arranged substantially along an upstanding middle axis of the container (2). Further new claim 8 calls for a electronic control unit (6) including a connection (10) to a power supply, a circuit closer for the electronic control unit (6) and a timer (16), with the electronic control unit (6) being constructed and arranged so that the electronic control unit (6) turns the apparatus (1) off after a certain period of time.

Such structure is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art cited.

In summary, applicant submits that the apparatus now claimed in new claim 8, clearly distinguishes applicant's apparatus from the teachings of all the references cited in this application and that all the claims are now in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that end is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

July 23, 2003



Thomas R. Vigil
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 SOUTH RIVERSIDE PLAZA
22nd Floor
CHICAGO, IL 60606-3912
Direct Telephone: 1-312-775-0407
Telephone: 1-312-655-1500
Fax: 1-312-655-1501
Email: trvigil@welshkatz.com